Tiberi Saxton Souder Schwarz (MI) Spratt Turner Sensenbrenner Stearns Upton Strickland Walden (OR) Sessions Shadegg Stupak Walsh Shaw Sullivan Wamp Sherwood Weldon (FL) Sweeney Shimkus Tancredo Weldon (PA) Shuster Tanner Weller Taylor (MS) Simpson Whitfield Skelton Taylor (NC) Wilson (SC) Smith (NJ) Wolf Terry Young (AK) Smith (TX) Thomas Thornberry Snyder Young (FL) Sodrel Tiahrt

NOES-157 Harman Neal (MA) Abercrombie Ackerman Herseth Olver Allen Higgins Owens Andrews Hinchev Pallone Baird Holt Pascrell Baldwin Honda. Pastor Hooley Bass Paul Bean Hoyer Payne Becerra Inslee Pelosi Berkley Israel Price (NC) Jackson (IL) Berman Rangel Jackson-Lee Roybal-Allard Biggert Bishop (NY) (TX) Ruppersberger Jefferson Boehlert Rush Boucher Johnson (CT) Saho Brady (PA) Johnson, E. B. Sánchez, Linda Jones (OH) Brown (OH) T. Butterfield Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta Kennedy (RI) Capps Sanders Capuano Kilpatrick (MI) Schakowsky Cardin Kind Schiff Schwartz (PA) Kirk Carnahan Carson Kucinich Scott (GA) Case Lantos Scott (VA) Castle Larsen (WA) Serrano Cleaver Larson (CT) Shavs Clvburn Lee Sherman Conyers Levin Simmons Crowlev Lewis (GA) Slaughter Cummings Lofgren, Zoe Smith (WA) Davis (CA) Lowey Solis Malonev Davis (FL) Stark Markey Tauscher Davis (IL) Thompson (CA) DeFazio Matsui DeGette McCarthy Thompson (MS) McCollum (MN) Delahunt Tiernev DeLauro McDermott Towns Dicks McGovern Udall (CO) Udall (NM) Dingell McKinney Meehan Meek (FL) Doggett Van Hollen Emanuel Velázquez Meeks (NY) Visclosky Engel Eshoo Menendez Wasserman Evans Michaud Schultz Farr Millender-Waters Fattah McDonald Watson Miller (NC) Filner Watt Frank (MA) Miller, George Waxman Gilchrest Moore (KS) Weiner Gonzalez Moore (WI) Wexler Green, Al Moran (VA) Woolsey Green, Gene Murphy Wu Nadler Grijalva Wynn

## NOT VOTING-7

Blumenauer Rothman Wilson (NM)
Brown, Corrine Westmoreland
Camp Wicker

Napolitano

## □ 1903

So the bill was passed.

Gutierrez

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1900

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLU-TION OF INQUIRY REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO TRANSMIT CERTAIN INFORMATION TO THE REPRESENTATIVES HOUSE OF RESPECTING A CLAIM MADE BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 2005, ATMEETING IN Α PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE, THAT THERE IS NOT A SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–58) together with dissenting views, on the resolution (H. Res. 170) of inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives respecting a claim made by the President on February 16, 2005, at a meeting in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, that there is not a Social Security trust, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO REINSTATE CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RULES RELATING TO PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO THE FORM IN WHICH THOSE PROVISIONS EXISTED AT THE CLOSE OF THE 108th CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–59) on the resolution (H. Res. 241) providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 240) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to reinstate certain provisions of the rules relating to procedures of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to the form in which those provisions existed at the close of the 108th Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 241

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution, House Resolution 240 is hereby adopted

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Lahood). The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 241.

The question was taken; and (twothirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 241.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Rochester, New York, the

distinguished ranking minority Member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides that upon its adoption, House Resolution 240 will be adopted. This will take us back to the 108th Congress's rules with regard to ethics, word for word, comma for comma, exactly the same rules that existed in the 108th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers understood the need for Members to scrutinize the actions of their peers. I commend those who, over the years, have volunteered for service to the House as members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the Father of our great Constitution, James Madison, in Federalist No. 57 said: "The aim of every political constitution is, or ought to be, first to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue the common good of society; and in the next place, to take the most effectual precautions for keeping them virtuous whilst they continue to hold their public trust."

Now, it is not surprising that our Constitution contains in Article I, section 5 the peer review requirements for each House of the Congress. Article 1, section 5 is as follows: "The House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members," and "may punish its Members for disorderly behavior."

Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we have recently seen that there are those who have wanted to use the ethics process for political purposes. At the start of the 109th Congress, our great Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), decided, along with the membership of the Republican Conference and through a vote of the full House, to include reforms of the ethics process because we believed it was flawed and needed increased transparency and accountability. Mr. Speaker, we still believe that.

The reforms adopted at the start of the 109th Congress were an effort to address the fairness of the ethics process.

Now, as many of you know, the ethics complaints filed at the end of the 108th Congress placed Members in jeopardy without any notice or opportunity for due process. That is not fair to any Member or to the institution itself.

Speaker Hastert justly has been concerned about the rights of every single Member of this institution on both sides of the aisle, and he has also been very concerned about the integrity of this institution in the eyes of the American people. The Members of this great body and the American people deserve a structure which provides due process in the area of ethics.

Accordingly, we tried to take political jeopardy out of the ethics process with our changes at the beginning of this Congress.